IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

RICHIE HILL,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	CIVIL NO. 06-cv-751-JPG
)	
LT. SAMPLES, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

GILBERT, District Judge:

Plaintiff, currently an inmate in the ADX in Florence, Colorado, brings this action for alleged violations of his constitutional rights by persons acting under the color of federal authority. *See Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). This case is now before the Court for a preliminary review of the complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, which provides:

- (a) **Screening.**—The court shall review, before docketing, if feasible or, in any event, as soon as practicable after docketing, a complaint in a civil action in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity.
- (b) **Grounds for Dismissal.** On review, the court shall identify cognizable claims or dismiss the complaint, or any portion of the complaint, if the complaint—
 - (1) is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or
 - (2) seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.

28 U.S.C. § 1915A. An action or claim is frivolous if "it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact." *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). Upon careful review of the complaint and any supporting exhibits, the Court finds it appropriate to exercise its authority under § 1915A; this action is legally frivolous and thus subject to summary dismissal.

The complaint and the numerous supplements are barely legible. It seems Plaintiff believes that various staff members in the Bureau of Prisons have conspired to kill him, and he wishes to bring criminal charges against these individuals. Despite his complaints, he alleges that the FBI has not investigated his allegations of conspiracy. He further alleges that Defendants have implanted a device in the back of his brain listen to his thoughts. Woven throughout his pleadings are references to the murder of James Curtis Martin; it is unclear who he is, or who allegedly killed him.

Among these ramblings, the Court has extracted two separate allegations of excessive force (*see* Doc. 1, pp. 4-5). In the first, Plaintiff alleges that while he was in the United States Penitentiary in Marion, Illinois, Defendant Samples stomped on his neck; it seems this incident might have occurred in early July of 2006.¹ On or about the same day, he alleges that Defendant Lockridge directed Defendant Hughes to break Plaintiff's finger, which allegedly was done.

The intentional use of excessive force by prison guards against an inmate without penological justification constitutes cruel and unusual punishment in violation of the Eighth Amendment and is actionable under Section 1983. *Hudson v. McMillian*, 503 U.S. 1, 6-7 (1992); *DeWalt v. Carter*, 224 F.3d 607, 619 (7th Cir. 2000). "[W]henever prison officials stand accused of using excessive physical force in violation of the Cruel and Unusual Punishments Clause, the core judicial inquiry is . . . whether force was applied in a good-faith effort to maintain or restore discipline, or maliciously and sadistically to cause harm." *Hudson*, 503 U.S. at 6-7. An inmate seeking damages for the use of excessive force need not establish serious bodily injury to make a claim, but not "every malevolent touch by a prison guard gives rise to a federal cause of action. . . .

¹ An affidavit from inmate Robert C. Hopes contradicts this assertion, stating that the incident with Samples occurred on May 6, 2005 as part of officers' response to an altercation between Plaintiff and other inmates. *See* Doc. 17, pp. 3-4.

[the] prohibition of 'cruel and unusual' punishment necessarily excludes from constitutional recognition de minimis uses of physical force, provided that the use of force is not of a sort 'repugnant to the conscience of mankind.'" *Id.* at 9-10; *see also Outlaw v. Newkirk*, 259 F.3d 833, 837-38 (7th Cir. 2001).

Based on the vague, brief allegations in the complaint, the Court is unable to dismiss these two excessive force claims at this point in the litigation. However, all other claims that might be present in the complaint and supplements are dismissed as illegible, incoherent, unspecific, and/or delusional. *See Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327-28 (1989); *Gladney v. Pendleton Correctional Facility*, 302 F.3d 773, 774 (7th Cir. 2002).

DISPOSITION

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants **BRYMER, LYEL, FOZZARD, DAVIS,** and **BUREAU OF PRISONS** are **DISMISSED** from this action with prejudice. Dismissal of these individuals pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A constitutes one of Plaintiff's three allotted strikes. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g); *see George v. Smith*, 507 F.3d 605, 607-08 (7th Cir. 2007); *Boriboune v. Berge*, 391 F.3d 852, 855 (7th Cir. 2004)

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff shall complete and submit a USM-285 form for the UNITED STATES ATTORNEY for the SOUTHERN DISTRICT of ILLINOIS and the ATTORNEY GENERAL of the UNITED STATES within THIRTY (30) DAYS of the date of entry of this Memorandum and Order. The Clerk is DIRECTED to send Plaintiff TWO (2) USM-285 forms with Plaintiff's copy of this Memorandum and Order. Plaintiff is advised that service will not be made on a defendant until Plaintiff submits a properly completed USM-285 form for that defendant.

The Clerk is **DIRECTED** to prepare Form 1A (Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver of Service of Summons) and Form 1B (Waiver of Service of Summons) for Defendants **SAMPLES**, **LOCKRIDGE** and **HUGHES**. The Clerk shall forward those forms, USM-285 forms submitted by Plaintiff, and sufficient copies of the complaint, including copies for the United States Attorney and the Attorney General, to the United States Marshal for service.

The United States Marshal is **DIRECTED**, pursuant to Rule 4(c)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to serve process on Defendants **SAMPLES**, **LOCKRIDGE** and **HUGHES** in the manner specified by Rule 4(d)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, *and* on the United States Attorney for the Southern District of Illinois and the Attorney General of the United States, Washington, D.C., pursuant to Rule 4(i) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. All costs of service shall be advanced by the United States. For purposes of computing the passage of time under Rule 4(d)(2), the Court and all parties will compute time as of the date it is mailed by the Marshal, as noted on the USM-285 form.

With respect to former employees of Bureau of Prisons who no longer can be found at the work address provided by Plaintiff, the Bureau of Prisons shall furnish the Marshal with the defendant's last-known address upon issuance of a court order which states that the information shall be used only for purposes of effectuating service (or for proof of service, should a dispute arise) and any documentation of the address shall be retained only by the Marshal. Address information obtained from the B.O.P. pursuant to this order shall not be maintained in the court file, nor disclosed by the Marshal.

The United States Marshal shall file returned waivers of service as well as any requests for waivers of service that are returned as undelivered as soon as they are received. If a waiver of

service is not returned by a defendant within **THIRTY** (30) **DAYS** from the date of mailing the request for waiver, the United States Marshal shall:

- Request that the Clerk prepare a summons for that defendant who has not yet returned a waiver of service; the Clerk shall then prepare such summons as requested.
- Personally serve process upon the defendant pursuant to Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and 28 U.S.C. § 566(c).
- Within ten days after personal service is effected, the United States Marshal shall file the return of service for the defendant, along with evidence of any attempts to secure a waiver of service of process and of the costs subsequently incurred in effecting service on said defendant. Said costs shall be enumerated on the USM-285 form and shall include the costs incurred by the Marshal's office for photocopying additional copies of the summons and complaint and for preparing new USM-285 forms, if required. Costs of service will be taxed against the personally served defendant in accordance with the provisions of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(d)(2) unless the defendant shows good cause for such failure.

Plaintiff is **ORDERED** to serve upon Defendants or, if appearance has been entered by counsel, upon that attorney, a copy of every further pleading or other document submitted for consideration by this Court. He shall include with the original paper to be filed with the Clerk of the Court a certificate stating the date that a true and correct copy of any document was mailed to defendant or his counsel. Any paper received by a district judge or magistrate judge which has not been filed with the Clerk or which fails to include a certificate of service will be disregarded by the Court.

Defendants are **ORDERED** to timely file an appropriate responsive pleading to the complaint, and shall not waive filing a reply pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(g).

Pursuant to Local Rule 72.1(a)(2), this cause is **REFERRED** to a United States Magistrate Judge for further pre-trial proceedings.

Further, this entire matter is hereby **REFERRED** to a United States Magistrate Judge for

disposition, as contemplated by Local Rule 72.2(b)(2) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), should all the parties

consent to such a referral.

Plaintiff is under a continuing obligation to keep the Clerk and each opposing party informed

of any change in his whereabouts. This shall be done in writing and not later than seven (7) days

after a transfer or other change in address occurs.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 29, 2008.

s/ J. Phil Gilbert

U. S. District Judge